

REMARKS

Claims 17, 18 and 22-23 are pending in the present Application. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 17, 18 and 22-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,760,118 to White et al. (White) in view of U.S. Publication No.2003/0130403 to Geprags et al. (Geprags), U.S. Patent Nos 6,872,777 to Adedeji et al. (Adedeji) and/or 4,654,405 to Jalbert et al. (Jalbert). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants also wish to thank the Examiner for his detailed response to the prior arguments. His comments were helpful to better understanding the Examiner's position.

In our previous response Applicants compared and contrasted several examples. The Examiner has, in some cases, disagreed with the comparison. For some comparisons it appears that there was insufficient communication regarding the significance of the comparison and as a result the Examiner did not understand the Applicants' point. In this response we will endeavor to more completely elucidate our points.

Previously Applicants compared Examples 8 and 10 of the pending application, noting that Example 8 uses high impact polystyrene and Example 10 uses polystyrene and SEBS. The Examiner has indicated that this is not a fair comparison because the two examples do not use the same materials. Applicants respectfully disagree and believe that the comparison of Examples 8 and 10 is more enlightening than what the Examiner proposes. It is well known that HIPS is a rubber modified polystyrene. Accordingly, a poly(arylene ether) composition containing HIPS would be expected to have better impact and tensile properties than a composition comprising plain polystyrene. Therefore, by comparing a Example 8 with Example 10 Applicants are actually making a more rigorous comparison than if Example 8 contained a polystyrene other than HIPS.

In the Final Office Action the Examiner appears to believe that Applicants were comparing Examples 1 and 2 alone and Examples 7 and 8 alone. Applicants intended to

compare and contrast the effects of capping seen between Examples 1 and 2 to the effects of capping seen between Examples 7 and 8 to demonstrate what a skilled person would have expected from the method of the pending claims. Examples 1 and 2 show that a capped poly(arylene ether), in the absence of other components, retains tensile strength after heat aging whereas an uncapped poly(arylene ether) does not. However, these results appear to depend on both the type of poly(arylene ether) (PPO I vs. PPO II) and the absence of additional components like the HIPS of Examples 7 and 8. Examples 7 and 8 show the **opposite trend** of Examples 1 and 2 – a composition containing capped poly(arylene ether) and HIPS as an additional component actually retains less tensile strength after aging than a composition containing uncapped poly(arylene ether). Given the data of Examples 7 and 8 a skilled artisan would expect that the addition of other components such as reinforcing filler and flame retardant in combination with polysalicylate would result in worse retention of tensile strength after aging than comparable compositions without polysalicylate. In contrast to this expectation Examples 12-13 and Example 16 unexpectedly show less loss of tensile strength than expected or no loss of tensile strength when compared to the relevant control example (Example 11 or Example 14).

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

135546-1
(GP20339US)

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to Applicants. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are requested.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 50-1131.

Respectfully submitted,
CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By /Patricia S. DeSimone/
Patricia S. DeSimone
Registration No. 48,137

Date: September 22, 2010
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
20 Church Street
22nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103
Telephone: (860) 286-2929
Facsimile: (860) 286-0115
Customer No.: 23413